



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/543,628 | 04/05/2000 | Nancy E. Iwamoto | 30-5010(4962) | 6586 |

7590

09/04/2002

Sandra P. Thompson
Rutan & Tucker, LLP
611 Anton Boulevard
Fourteenth Floor
Costa Mesa, CA 92626-1998

EXAMINER

FEELY, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1712

DATE MAILED: 09/04/2002

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/543,628

Applicant(s)

IWAMOTO, NANCY E.

Examiner

Michael J Feely

Art Unit

1712

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: Claim 2-6 include bracketed text.

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-9.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):

Claims 1-9: 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as set forth in paragraph 6 of the Final Rejection .

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding the rejection of claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph, Applicant has proposed the deletion of the term "group" from the claims; however, this does not solve the enablement issue in claims 2-6. Applicant also reiterates the argument that a person of ordinary skill in the art of semiconductor design and/or polymer chemistry would be able to, without undue experimentation, produce the polymers recited in claims 2-6. The Examiner respectfully disagrees for the reasons set forth in paragraphs 5 and 12 of the Final Rejection.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1 and 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Chetcuti (US Pat. No. 5,393,606), Applicants have overlooked the critical citations of the reference. Column 5, lines 1-5, discloses a composition comprising a) a thermosetting, thermoplastic or structurally crosslinked polymer and b) a CT complex of formula 1, wherein the crosslinked polymers of a) are selected from polymers derived from epoxy resins, including triglycidyl isocyanurate (column 8, lines 18-53). A polymer derived from triglycidyl isocyanurate anticipates the polymer claimed in claim 1. Chetcuti meets the limitations of claims 6-9, as set forth in paragraph 11 of the Final Rejection.



Robert Dawson
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700